REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated February 22, 2008, claims 1-27 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below.

Claims 1-27 are canceled and new claims 28-62 are added. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Objection to the Specifications

In the 1st paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the paragraphs [0028] and [0029] because they contain an embedded hyperlink or other form of browser-executable code. Applicants have amended the specification to delete the embedded hyperlink or other form of embedded browser-executable code, and request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e) in View of Reese

In the 3rd paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Reese et al. (US 7,298,512). Claims 1-27 are canceled. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to newly added claims 28-62.

Claims 1-27 have been canceled, thus this rejection is no longer applicable. In the interests of advancing prosecution, however, claims 28-62 will be discussed with respect to the cited reference.

Claims 28, 46, and 57 respectively describe a method, a printer system, and a computer program product for printing time-based media content processed by an embedded multimedia server, the method comprising:

> monitoring streaming media content from a time-based media source input to the printer;
> selecting a portion of the streaming media content based on a plurality of user defined criteria;
> indexing the selected portion of the streaming media content;
> constructing a storable representation for the selected portion of the streaming media content; and
> generating a printout of the storable representation.

These aspects of the invention are not disclosed by Reese. Reese discloses a printer with an embedded database driver to convert data input to a database compatible format. The Examiner alleged that Reese describes monitoring multimedia content based on criteria, indexing a content selection based on criteria, and generating an index document for the content selection in Column 4, lines 11-19 (The embedded web server enables the printer to provide a web page that allows users to interact with the printer in order to control and/or provide information that is to be entered into a database. The information can include the database server name, database engine type, and database login information. Additionally, the web page might allow users to add additional ODBC data sources so that the printer could support proprietary or less popular database engines that are not already loaded in the printer memory). *See* Office Action at page 11. The embedded web server of Reese processes only static web pages, but is unable to monitor *streaming media content*, select a portion of the *streaming media content*, or index the selected portion of the *streaming media content* as recited in claims 28, 46, and 57. This difference is not trivial. Monitoring, selecting, and indexing streaming media requires significantly more sophisticated processing than necessary for static media, making the claimed multimedia server more difficult, and

less likely, to be embedded in a printer device. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 28, 46, and 57 are patentably distinguishable over Reese.

Claims 35, 50, and 58 also recite similar limitations corresponding to actions taken on streaming media, and thus Applicants submit that claims 35, 50, and 58 also are patentably distinguishable over Reese for the above reasons. In addition, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Reese of "receiving user input... **indicating a participant speaker**," "segmenting" and "indexing" the streaming media content based on the speaker in the recorded video meeting, nor "selecting a media clip...illustrating a time period" when the speaker is speaking in the recorded video meeting.

Claims 41, 56, and 60 respectively describe a method, a printer system, and a computer program product for capturing the referenced multimedia content data, the method comprising:

> receiving a document in a print job;
> extracting a Uniform Resource Locator from the document;
> retrieving a content web page identified by the Uniform Resource Locator referenced
>   in the document;
> constructing a printable representation of the retrieved content web page;
> associating the printable representation with a thumbnail image; and
> displaying the associated thumbnail image in an embedded printer display of the
>   printer.

Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Reese of receiving a document in a print job, extracting a URL from the document, retrieving a web page identified by the referenced URL, constructing a printable representation of the web page, associating the printable representation of the web page with a thumbnail image, nor displaying the thumbnail image in an embedded printer display.

Dependent claims 29-34, 36-40, 42-45, 47-49, 51-55, 59, and 61-62 variously depend from claims 28, 35, 41, 46, 50, 56-58, and 60, which were shown above to be patentable over

the cited reference. In addition, these claims recite additional limitations that also are not disclosed by the cited reference. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 29-34, 36-40, 42-45, 47-49, 51-55, 59, and 61-62 also are patentably distinct over the cited art.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 28-62, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request allowance of claims 28-62.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jonathan J. Hull et al.

Date: May 22, 2008   By: /Jennifer R. Bush/

Jennifer R. Bush
Registration No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650)335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200